HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XV, No. 4 Monday, January 27, 1958 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

MISSILES: *No crash program* (page 1)
FARMERS: *Soil bank satire* (page 1)
NEW JERSEY: *Morris vs. "coattails"* (page 2)
DEFICIT SPENDING: *Ike against himself* (page 3)
LABOR: *Reuther's "union-busting"* (page 3)

Capital Cat Chorus: The strange, discordant sounds emerging from the Potomac area give constituents out in the country an impression of complete confusion in the Nation's Capital.

The HUMAN EVENTS staff, separating shrieks from facts, groans from rumors, seeks to relay the best considered answers to the worried questions from the home front, as follows:

● *What's the word on missiles?* No precise answer possible. It would apparently take 96 McCarthys working many months to drag out of generals and admirals the facts about the real performance of Atlas, Polaris, Thor, Jupiter (why not "Lucifer"?), *etc.* But members of Congress do have a guess, arrived at by inductive reasoning.

It's this: What goes on is no crash program — the Pentagon just puts on an act that it is. How do Congressmen know that? Well, a crash program obviously means that you cut out nonessentials in order to push the essentials. But today, the nonessentials continue as before: factories keep on turning out "bayonet-fighting" type of weapons; flag officers' clubs stubbornly resist curtailment of golf links and other forms of entertainment; scientists go on studying the sex life of frogs, *etc.* The conclusion Congressmen drearily draw is that the missiles program — despite publicity stunts — isn't really progressing.

● *How's Ike's health?* On the Hill they still argue whether the ambulance, stretcher and hospital corpsmen that were stationed nearby when the President gave his State of the Union address were there for the President or for one of the ailing legislators. No matter — talk piles up day by day that Ike physically and mentally is functioning very much below par.

The last Presidential press conference deepened the gloom of many Ike admirers. One fluff which started gossip was his inability to remember the name of the Federal Reserve Board. After much groping all he got out was "Federal . . . Federal board." (See transcript of the press conference in *The New York Times*, January 16, page 14, column 7.)

Finally, his talk at the GOP rally did not allay alarm. An Ike appointee in a big agency said to HUMAN EVENTS: "My God, I was shocked. I didn't know he was like that."

● *What's the solution?* Democrats — both Southern and Northern "liberal" — privately express fear of the obvious solution. But many Republicans (privately, because of "party regularity") say Ike ought to resign and let vigorous young Dick Nixon take over for the good of the country and of the party.

Democrats in general fear Nixon would then enjoy a popular honeymoon, might push things so well that by 1960 he'd be a national hero (see HUMAN EVENTS for January 6, 1958). Southern Democrats, who otherwise would be rooters for the Vice President, dislike him because of his "civil rights" stand.

Nixon — it is believed — would take hold, knock heads together in the Pentagon, clean out the White House and pursue a clear, consistent policy — instead of the program of backtrack and snafu of which Ike and his Palace Guard have been guilty.

● *Who's winning the talkfest?* The back and forth between professional politicos — Democratic and Republican — as to who's responsible for the missile mess rends the air these days.

As public relations experts here see it, the Democrats are ahead in this contest (despite a few pinpricks from Sherman Adams) — for the following reason: The Republican leaders (and/or their speech-writers) suffer from the prohibition against "McCarthyism" which the Modern Republicans (including crypto-Democrats) in the Administration have imposed on the party. Example: Truman said Ike was a leader who couldn't do anything but take orders; and that he (Truman) gave the orders himself when he was President. "Give-em-hell Harry" left himself wide open by this remark. It is suggested that the Republicans should have offered the riposte: "Who gave Harry his orders? Answer: Alger Hiss and Harry Dexter White."

Nor have GOP speakers revived memories of the mink coat and income tax deals of the Truman era — well described in the book by Jules Abels, *The Truman Scandals* (Regnery), exposing a chapter of history which makes the GOP oil scandals of the Twenties look pale by comparison. So long as this inhibited policy rules GOP forensic strategy, the Democrats will continue to win on points — so runs the verdict of kibitzers in the Capital.

● *How's Ezra doing?* Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Benson fares badly even among right wingers in his own party. Senator Goldwater (R.-Ariz.) read a letter from a constituent to the upper house, dealing caustically with the Benson program:

"My friend Bordeaux over in Pima County received a $1000 check from the Government this year for not raising hogs. So I am going into the not-raising-hogs business next year. What I want to know is, in your

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion what is the best kind of farm not to raise hogs on and the best kind of hogs not to raise? The hardest work in this business is going to be in keeping an inventory of how many hogs I haven't raised. I plan to operate on a small scale at first, holding myself down to about 4000 hogs, which means I will have $80,000. Now these hogs I will not raise will not eat 100,000 bushels of corn. So will you pay me for not raising 100,000 bushels of corn not to feed the hogs I am not raising?"

Capitol Hill Briefs: Despite "liberal" reports to the contrary, protests against high Federal spending continue to arrive in congressional offices. But unfortunately, say members, such protests this year seem to come only from the "little man" — the kind of writer who uses a pencil on blue-lined note paper. Conspicuous by their absence are letters from the businessmen who played a big part in last year's wave of opposition to the high Budget. The question is raised: do businessmen in general believe that Government spending is a sound way out of the present recession?

● The project for passing a "sense of the Senate" resolution opposing a Summit conference remains stalled in the cloakrooms. Reason: if the wording followed the Dulles formula, it would have to include some such qualification as: "no Summit meeting, *unless* Moscow shows by deeds that it would play fair." Through the door of "unless," it is feared, the appeasers would seek to build up a case for holding such a top-level parley, citing various alleged "deeds" by Soviet Russia (such as her recent announcement of a decrease in armed forces). Also, while it is felt the country does not want a Summit gathering, the public is not sufficiently aroused to demand a Senate resolution.

That feeling may prove to be wrong, it is said, if women's groups and others lay down a barrage of letters on Capitol Hill (see "Woman's Place is Under the Dome," by Elizabeth Churchill Brown in HUMAN EVENTS for January 13, 1958).

● The death of Democratic Senator Neely has left vacant a seat on the key Judiciary Committee — the body which has to tackle such questions as "civil rights" legislation, the Supreme Court problem, *etc.* Southern Democrats and Northern GOP conservatives have a candidate for the place — Senator Strom Thurmond (D.-S.C.). In their opinion, the former Governor has built up a fine reputation as a defender of individual rights and constitutional Government during his period in the Senate.

● Conservatives on Capitol Hill suffered a great loss last week by the sudden death of Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.). A key member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Smith waged a gallant fight against foreign aid and international boondoggling. A staunch anti-Communist, he persistently demanded severance of relations with Soviet Russia. And he voted as courageously as he talked (for example, although a Northern Republican, he refused to go along with the Administration's "civil rights" drive, viewing it as an invasion of states' rights).

Finally, his advice and guidance to right-wing Republicans in the House was extremely valuable and will be keenly missed. HUMAN EVENTS takes pride in recalling his article of December 29, 1948, entitled "Republican Responsibility." Appearing in the aftermath of the great GOP defeat of that year, Smith's piece was a ringing challenge to the best elements of the party. The fighting conservative course he recommended proved to be the pattern of the GOP policy which led to the defeat of Trumanism in 1952.

No Coattail Rider: The campaign of Robert Morris (recently chief prober of subversive activities for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee), for the GOP Senatorial nomination in New Jersey, is going better. It started under unfavorable auspices, as Morris is not well known throughout his state and the state Republican organization is against him. At first, his principal opponent was Bernard Shanley, ex-White House aide, who enjoys powerful financial and social support in New Jersey. A few weeks ago, observers friendly to Morris said only a miracle could make him the winner.

Now the atmosphere has changed, for several reasons. Besides Shanley, two other Modern Republicans have thrown their hats in the ring: Congressmen Kean and Frelinghuysen, both wealthy and "modern." Additionally, state Senator Jones, "boss" of Bergen County and an "organization man" pure and simple, has joined the race. Friends of Morris now say he has a chance of getting a plurality, because these three candidates will split the Modern Republican vote.

Furthermore, Morris is striving to erase his principal handicap — "not well-enough known to the voters." He's been energetically shaking hands in various parts of the state and making friends everywhere. Grass-roots groups which had given up the Grand Old Party in New Jersey (because of its Modern Republican leadership) have begun to take an interest in Morris, and simultaneously a new interest in politics.

Finally, when Morris — who is no "coattail" rider — came out for a right-to-work law in New Jersey, he gave his bid for nomination a new luster among the political gentry. His Modern Republican opponents are tied to the position of Ike's Secretary of Labor, James Mitchell, who has put the White House on record in opposition to a Federal right-to-work law. Morris can do some free swinging on this live issue, say Garden State observers, with no little effect on GOP conservatives, not to mention the growing number of rank-and-file union members who look to right-to-work legislation for protection against the Becks and Reuthers.

Veterans in political club-houses say that Morris campaigns in the classic tradition of former New Jersey Senator Albert Hawkes, who won office in 1942 on a right-to-work platform. Hawkes made a fine record in the Senate, but while he was away in Washington the Modern Republicans in Jersey organized against him and prevented his renomination. The GOP in Jersey has never been the same since Hawkes left. Morris raises a standard around which the disappointed right wing can rally.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Red Ink: Many in Washington regret that the President now seems to accept a policy of deficit spending. Ike has apparently forgotten — it is pointed out — his strong emphasis on the evils of "red ink" in speeches during his successful campaign for the Presidency in 1952. At that time he made many promises to end deficit spending and unsound fiscal practices. In Paterson, N.J., October 16, 1952, he warned:

> **"Someone, my friends, is making a terrible error. They believe that we can have and maintain military strength above our capacity to pay for it. Our form of government means that in the long run over a period of years you cannot pile deficit upon deficit and have left the kind of economy that we have known."**

The next day, in Wilmington, Del., he specifically pledged himself: "We will stop wild spending of your money and prevent these recurring national deficits from putting the pressure on your money to go down and down."

And in Worcester, Mass., October 20, he "laid it on the line," as follows: "I believe that the social gains achieved by the people of the United States . . . are not only here to stay, but are here to be improved and extended. I do promise, through prudent handling of Government expenditures, through the elimination of the national deficit, through halting inflation, and through eventual lowering of taxes, to preserve for the people of the United States these security gains. I do not believe that these gains should be secretly whittled away by creeping inflation. Our first task must be to go after waste and extravagance . . . By this means, we will be able, first to eliminate the deficit, and then to lower taxes."

Labor Front: Labor's twin apostles of "liberalism," left-wing bosses Walter Reuther and David Dubinsky, appeared recently in the role of "union-busters" — an epithet they have frequently thrown at anyone who disagrees with them. The occasion was an attempt by the AFL-CIO's organizing staff (215 men) to form their own federation to seek improvement of wages, hours and working conditions. This effort met with stony opposition from the Reuther-Dubinsky faction of the AFL-CIO executive council. (Reuther's group won out over President George Meany and the union's legal battery, who were sympathetic to the maneuver.)

Moreover, when the organizers took their case to the National Labor Relations Board, the Reutherites retaliated. Under the guise of "economy," the AFL-CIO has fired or transferred nearly half of the organizers — including the secretary-treasurer of the new union, who had been a CIO organizer for ten years.

In contrast to its protestations of economy, the AFL-CIO only last fall originated a $1.2 million public relations program, designed to counteract the supposed "union-busting" effects of the McClellan committee investigations. Even "liberals" found this episode difficult to justify. Said New York *Post* columnist Murray Kempton: "It should cost more than that to convince anybody, given this record, that the unions are not sick at the core."

● A new maneuver is forthcoming from the Fund for the Republic, which has spent the greater part of a $15 million grant allegedly defending the Constitution and the Bill of Rights — particularly when those documents can be stretched to extend protection to Communists and fellow travellers. As part of a new program, the group has just completed a $100,000 study of "freedom and democracy" in the labor movement. Verdict of the freedom-loving Fund on legislation to protect individuals from the evils of compulsory unionism: "neither possible . . . nor, on balance, wise."

MacArthur: As America seeks to marshal its full resources in the struggle against communism, one name appears with increasing frequency in Capital conversation — that of General Douglas MacArthur. It is known that the famous general, who marked his 78th birthday January 26, is as acute as ever in his perception of the Communist menace, and as masterly in his grasp of strategic principle. (Recalled is the verdict of Britain's World War II chief of staff, Field Marshal Viscount Alanbrooke, that MacArthur was "the greatest general" of the war.)

Why, then — comes the question — does not the Eisenhower Administration consult with MacArthur, to attain the benefit of his counsel? It is rumored that Eisenhower has long felt resentment toward MacArthur, his old boss. But surely — it is said — such personal animosities should be buried at a time when national security is the overriding consideration.

Those who advocate consultation with MacArthur point out how prophetically, at the time of the famous "MacArthur hearings," he foretold the challenges that would confront American policy in the crucial years following Korea. "If the United States doesn't bring the Korean war to a decisive and victorious end," MacArthur told the Senate committee, "she will have to accept all the consequences of a disastrous defeat." Even MacArthur's critics, such as columnists Joseph and Stewart Alsop, have since admitted the correctness of this analysis.

Again, MacArthur warned that America's dogged "Europe-first" policy ignored the simple realities of Communist aspiration. "The objective of Russia for many decades," he said, "was the Mediterranean. . . . Without that, Russia could not dominate and control the world. . . . [Now, there is the additional] possibility of reaching the warm waters of the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. If by any combination she could extend down to the Indian Ocean, she would not only outflank the Mediterranean . . . but it would place her fair and flush upon the continent of Africa. . . ."

Similarly, in the matter of armaments, the General proved to be well ahead of his critics. The "liberal" line seeking to justify MacArthur's removal from his Korean and other commands said that Soviet armed might was such, in 1951, that the US must avoid a showdown, building for a final confrontation in the future. This idea was advanced in the hearings by Senators Brien McMahon (D.-Conn.) and Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.). MacArthur answered them: "You assume, of course, that relatively your strength is going up much

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more than the enemy's. That is a doubtful assumption, Senator." And: ". . . you do not know, none of us know, the capacity of the enemy. He may build faster than we do."

Progressive Education: The long-ascendant doctrines of "progressive" education continue to draw the fire of analysts revaluating America's school system (see HUMAN EVENTS for December 20, 1957 and January 6, 1958):

● Speaking before the American Football Coaches' Association in Philadelphia, January 8, Vice President Nixon commented pointedly on the role of competition in athletics, education and the life of nations. "Our young men," said Nixon, "are going to enter a competitive world where they will experience failure as well as success. They won't be properly prepared for life if they have been shielded from the disappointment of failure, whether in the classroom or on the athletic field."

● In an interview in the January 24, 1958 issue of *US News and World Report*, Professor Arthur Bestor, long-time foe of the progressivists, launches a devastating attack on "progressive education," citing chapter and verse on its neglect of the fundamentals.

"In the light of Sputnik," Bestor says, "life-adjustment education turns out to have been something perilously close to 'death adjustment' for our Nation and our children."

● Representative Ralph Gwinn (R.-N.Y.) last week delivered a comprehensive analysis of America's educational woes and the various cures proposed for them. Producing a wealth of statistical evidence, Gwinn showed that expenditures for public education have spiralled up, since 1929, faster than any other item of national expense. But the money, he pointed out, has gone to construct "palatial" school houses, in which students are taught such things as "grooming, clothing selection and social conduct." Clearly, Gwinn concluded, the cure for our difficulties is not financial: "If the schools cut back on frills and reinstate learning to its proper place, there will be no additional cost. If there is no intention of curtailing frills, more money won't do any good." (Copies of Gwinn's speech may be obtained by writing to Room 541, House Office Building, Washington 25, D. C.)

● Meanwhile, Dr. Guy E. Snavely, interim President of Lafayette College, issued a stern statement opposing the Administration's scholarship program. In a letter to members of the House Ways and Means Committee, he said:

"*It is a sad day when every type of activity feels it must run to the Federal Government for financial aid, thus bringing extra expense to the taxpayers and the early domination by bureaucrats.*"

Sufficient means exist, Snavely concluded, to provide education for those students who could not themselves afford the costs of their schooling.

Pity the Poor Inventor: "Liberals" bemoaning the status of creative scientific endeavor in the American defense project — say military analysts — obscure the real impediment to more rapid advancement in this area. For, whereas "liberals" berate security precautions designed to keep valuable information out of the hands of Communists, the flow of scientific invention has, in fact, been hindered by the collectivist tendencies of the New and Fair Deals.

A Georgetown University survey of 500 leading inventors, for example, discloses that they dislike dealing with the bureaucracy (38 per cent said they had refrained from bringing devices possibly useful in defense to the attention of the Government) for these reasons: (a) insufficient pay for their inventions; (b) too much red tape; (c) antagonism from Government administrators; (d) denial of invention rights.

Commented New York Herald-Tribune *science editor Earl Ubell: "the study shows that inventors prefer to work with industry rather than Government, because the financial rewards are greater, there is less red tape, and the people are more interested and helpful."*

Cited in connection with the inventors' fear that their invention rights will be taken from them is an article by patent attorney Richard Spencer, in the October, 1957, issue of the *Journal of the Patent Office Society*. Spencer traces the decline of American invention, and the antagonism between inventors and the Government, to the inception of the New Deal. The bugaboo of "technological unemployment," Spencer points out, made the New Dealers unfriendly towards advances in the natural sciences. Consequently, administrative and court decisions were forthcoming to balk inventive zeal — primarily through the invalidation of patents. ("One appellate judge stated that as long as he sat on the bench he would never sustain a patent.") "The advancement of the natural sciences. . ," Spencer relates, "lost out to the development of the social sciences, as represented in the New Deal by Messrs. Harold Ickes, Harry Hopkins and Henry Wallace."

DEAN CLARENCE MANION, Former Dean, Notre Dame Law School: "I have received and read every copy of HUMAN EVENTS since the first day it was issued. It is literally indispensable to any American who must know the background of the really important news."

REV. C. W. FLIETSTRA, Pastor, DeMotte Christian Reformed Church, DeMotte, Indiana: "I enjoy reading every issue of HUMAN EVENTS. It surely represents the 'inside facts' as they are in political circles at Washington or the Hill."

Additional copies of this 4-page News Section: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1000 copies $30. In 5000 lots $25 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy; for airmail, add two cents a copy.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.
Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.
By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.
Bound Annual Volume for 1957, with complete index, $15. 1955 and 1956 volumes available at same price. None available for previous years.
Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.
The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1958.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XV, No. 4 HUMAN EVENTS January 27, 1958

Article Section *Printed in Two Sections*

WHAT WOULD A "PREVENTIVE WAR" PREVENT?

By FREDERIC NELSON

THERE MUST BE something wrong with this syllogism: *A*. The side that strikes the first blow in a hydrogen-ballistic missile war will almost certainly win, while the side which comes in second will probably be annihilated. *B*. The United States will never strike the first blow. *C*. Therefore — But few of us have the courage to complete the equation.

Is there no escape from the conclusion that we must accept annihilation in order to be true to what General Leslie R. Groves describes as our "long established and historic national policy" that "we must never strike the first blow"? Is there nothing to do but cringe in the corner until Khrushchev drops that other shoe?

General Groves, in a New Year's Day interview with William Hillman, for the North American Newspaper Alliance, declared that, while this policy of restraint puts the United States at a military disadvantage, it may be a deterrent to the outbreak of war. "If Russia knows we won't attack first," reasoned General Groves, "the Kremlin will be very much less apt to attack us . . . Soviet Russia knows that there does not have to be a war unless she starts it."

Conversely, the Kremlin also knows that, if it can carry out its subversive and aggressive plans without fear of being clobbered, it need not resort to war in order to achieve its purposes. As Professor Robert Strausz-Hupé, of the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School, put it two years ago in *US News and World Report:*

> **"Once the potential aggressor knows that he need not reckon with the anticipatory action of his opponent, and that only direct military attack will provoke the intended victim into retaliatory action, he can apply safely any and all stratagems of conquest short of direct military attack."**

That is how the Soviet Union has been playing it throughout the period of American nuclear superiority. Now that the USSR appears to have pulled up even with us, its leaders can be relied on to become increasingly demanding and aggressive. They can now rely, not only on our "long established policy" of not striking the first blow, but on the added probability that, after unsentimentally figuring the odds, we wouldn't care to do so anyway. A policy supposedly based on high, moral forbearance now becomes a matter of cold military calculation. Because we apparently find ourselves outgunned, at any rate in certain important areas, diplomatic dealing with the Kremlin becomes, as Dr. Strausz-Hupé predicted, "a one-way street along which the potential aggressor pushes his intended victim — now quieting its fears by hearty smiles and well-advertised, though trivial, concessions, now goading it into angry verbal protests by the summary refusal to make any concessions whatever — toward public humiliation, diplomatic isolation and domestic demoralization."

DR. Strausz-Hupé was writing in 1956, before our military plight had been fully revealed. He warned then that "to abjure the use of force under all circumstances except self-defense in a contest with a revolutionary power is a fateful decision. The principal deterrent to the revolutionary aggressor is the *status quo* power's capability of forestalling him with superior force." He asks the question: *"Is it possible to argue that the United States would now be less secure and the prospect of human freedom less bright, had the United States weighed its power diplomatically and, in the last resort militarily, in order to force the Soviet Union to surrender its unlawful gains and renounce its sponsorship of international subversion?"*

From pre-ICBM American history the answer is clear enough. Our national existence began with a war in which the Americans struck the first blow. When things reached a state of intolerability to the colonists, they hit the British with "the shot heard round the world" — and took more than a year to cite in the Declaration of Independence their reasons for resorting to military action. And we need go back no farther than Pearl Harbor to find the United States evading the established policy of not striking the first blow by the simple

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. • Copyright 1958 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expedient of chivvying the potential enemy into striking it. That worked very well against a power which was not equipped with long-range missiles. The fact that it appears impracticable in present circumstances does not mean that it has ever been American policy, or the policy of any other country, to accept an intolerable threat to its security through reluctance to use force, or, at any rate, the threat of force.

Assistant Secretary of State Robert Murphy, in 1954, agreed that our then mighty armament of atomic weapons "will be called into play only to put down aggression." But he added an important footnote: "Neither does the United States propose to invite its own annihilation. We cannot—we will not be annihilated."

Not only has the United States refused to be annihilated, but it has taken military action on many occasions when the threat to our security was hardly that serious. The war with Mexico and various forays into Latin America come to mind, and one must be naive indeed to assume that there would have been no war with Spain in 1898 even if the *Maine* had not been sunk! In short, the USA became a "great power" by acting like one, and maintained that status by resorting to force when its position was threatened by rivals far less ruthless and menacing than the Soviet Union and its network of Communist agents and subsidiaries are today.

FURTHERMORE, every agency of "collective security," whether projected by idealists or put into operation by supposedly practical statesmen, has assumed that force might be needed at some point if peace was to be preserved. Article X of the old League of Nations covenant guaranteed the members not only against aggression but against "any threat or danger of such aggression." And Article XI declared that "any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not," was the concern of the whole League and justified the League in taking "any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations." The United Nations Charter, while watering down this threat by the veto power, does not limit its activities to the passive posture of waiting for the first blow to be struck. The Charter authorizes action to meet "any threat to the peace."

For at least five years after World War II this country had the physical means, backed by ample legal and traditional authority, to curb the Communist conspiracy and Soviet aggression as effectively as the Congress of Vienna dealt with Czarist Russia after the Napoleonic wars. What happened to American (and West European) perspicacity to account for our failure to take advantage of our undoubted capabilities?

One explanation is very simple. It covers also the reason why we are behind the eight ball on missiles. It is the lack of a sense of urgency among the people, which in turn is explained by the failure of their leaders to picture the Communist conspiracy as a real and present danger to the United States. Plus, of course, the "treason of the intellectuals," as the French writer Julien Benda put it. It is to our so-called elite that we owe the appalling ignorance of the nature and extent of the Communist conspiracy. Professor Stefan T. Possony of Georgetown University, in his brilliant book, *A Century of Conflict* (Regnery), demonstrated the essentially military character of the Soviet assault against the world.

Lenin's favorite writer, next to Marx, was the German military theoretician Von Clausewitz. Dr. Possony comments: "Lenin extracted statements to the effect that in addition to the hostile military force and his territory, the *will* of the enemy is the primary objective of war." To Lenin, as to all Communists, the important thing was to soften up the intended victim from within. "The Communists," Dr. Possony explains, "have accepted Clausewitz's statement that no strong power *not* in the throes of internal discord can be defeated." General MacArthur, during the "MacArthur hearings," declared rightly that Communist use of "propaganda, of creating confusion, of bewilderment, of belittling and assassinating characters of people that are opposed to them" was "allied to" military force.

But this obvious relationship between the Reds' Mr. Outside and Mr. Inside was lost on the elite, especially the writing elite. Not only did its luminaries reject the idea that American Communists and fellow travelers were serving an international military conspiracy, but they pretty well drove from public life anybody in politics who attempted to establish the relationship. The very columnists who are now railing against President Eisenhower and former Secretary Wilson for our failure to excel in missiles put in the better part of seven years chasing the late Senator McCarthy around the stump for the crime of blowing the whistle on Communists in the Federal bureaucracy!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why do we look bad in missiles and weapons generally? Largely because the people were told by our bright columnists that the few men who sought to warn the Nation of its danger were either hysterical or sadistically devoted to persecuting unpopular "liberals." The boys who are now yelling for weapons were only a few months ago sneering at Secretary Dulles for suggesting that this country might actually retaliate against a Soviet attack. And even now, while the Reds' Mr. Outside is represented as possessing "ultimate weapons" that we are supposed to be without, the Supreme Court compounds our peril by making it all but impossible to cope with the efforts of Mr. Inside to eviscerate us in preparation for the full treatment later on.

If the Soviet geophysicians hadn't spun that Sputnik over our credulous heads, we would doubtless still be languishing in the complacent notion that there was nothing in Russian military preparation that another Summit meeting couldn't cure.

Indeed, "negotiation" with the Red tyrants, formerly touted as a means of "demonstrating American good faith," is now getting another ride in the columns, this time strictly from fright. One expert went so far as to suggest that, in order to prove ourselves worthy to be received by Dictator Khrushchev, the President should fire John Foster Dulles!

IN THIS KIND of going, "preventive war" is always a tempting "out," just as murder seems the only solution to some individuals who find themselves cemented to an uncongenial spouse who refuses a divorce. During the Egyptian fracas, Premier Pinaud of France amused himself by reflecting upon what might have happened if France had moved into the Rhineland in 1935 when Hitler occupied the area in defiance of the Versailles Treaty terms. Many people would have been killed, Pinaud said, property would have been destroyed. And, he concluded, the official who ordered the troops to move would have been denounced by all right-thinking people and would still live in infamy – because none could know that he had prevented the outbreak of a war which would kill 15 million men.

The same situation existed in respect to Soviet Russia in 1945 and for at least five years thereafter. In a remarkable and too little-known book, *Popular Diplomacy and War* (published by Richard R. Smith), the late Sisley Huddleston, a journalist who had covered the diplomatic waterfront for years, wrote: "We could easily have stopped Russian expansion in 1944 and 1945. There ought never to have been any dangerous Russian expansion or a Russian menace." Our failure to do so was attributed by Huddleston to popular diplomacy, which became so infected by its own propaganda that it lost the ability to shift its position as the world balance of power shifted. Perhaps not even a Metternich or a Talleyrand could prevail against "crowd psychology" whipped up by modern propaganda machines. How much less a Truman, or even an Eisenhower!

But not even when the crowd has turned and is running in the opposite direction does Huddleston believe in "preventive war" as the solution. "We have dealt the cards. We needlessly gave Russia the aces; so we cannot complain because she plays them to her advantage . . . We cannot just kick over the card table and start a fight . . . But we can play the cards that remain in our hands with greater skill." Since Mr. Huddleston wrote (1954) the USSR has picked up a few more aces and Big Casino to boot.

How to replay a hand so badly misplayed in the past is a problem that might well baffle philosophers. Preventive war is impracticable, even if you ignore its moral implications, because it wouldn't prevent anything. But do we have to just sit here and wait until we are considered by the Communist high command to have been sufficiently debilitated by fear and propaganda to be ripe for the kill?

Former Ambassador George Kennan thinks the solution is to high-tail it out of Germany in exchange for a similar move by the Soviet forces. (We to retire some 4,000 miles, the Red Army perhaps ten.) But the net result of that would be the gobbling of all Germany by the Reds, with catastrophic consequences to what is left of West European morale. It is difficult to figure this as anything but surrender in advance of an ultimatum.

General Norstad, Supreme Commander of NATO, gets around the question by expressing the view (in *US News and World Report*) that the retaliatory power of the West is sufficient to make a "first blow" by the Russians unlikely. The probable price an aggressor would have to pay, he believes, would deter an aggressor from making such a foolish move. This, of course, is what all of us hope. And General Norstad is doubtless right about immediate direct assault on this country – unless the Kremlin conspirators, relying on their current superiority in certain categories of weapons, should decide not to make the mistake the Germans made twice when they permitted the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

peace-minded Americans to catch up. But the consolidation of Communist satellite control, the subversion of Asiatic areas containing Western raw materials and the continued infiltration of our own institutions remain unchecked. Since the ultimate success of the Communist plan of conquest depends, as Lenin saw it, on the communization of the Orient, we can be scarcely less concerned with the rapid development of that phase of the plot than we are with the possibility of direct military attack.

Captain W. D. Puleston, USN (Retd.), is less optimistic about our ability to avert a first blow than is General Norstad. In the same issue of *US News and World Report,* Puleston declares that "it is perilous to assume that in the future the Red general staff will be deterred from attack by fear of retaliation. In 1941 Stalin deliberately risked provoking Hitler rather than abandon Russian ambitions in the Balkans. [Still, he left it to Hitler to strike the first blow.] The Kremlin, we may assume, would not hesitate to strike if it considered success probable." Captain Puleston suggests that the policy for this country should be to meet "positive evidence" of preparation of an attack upon this country by serving notice that, unless the threatening nation "dismounts the attack preparations within a specified period of time, the United States will attack in self-defense, without waiting to be hit first."

OF COURSE, if we are as inferior militarily to the Soviet Union as the volunteer interpreters of the Gaither report say we are, the presumption is that we would get hit before our ultimatum got to Moscow. Captain Puleston doubts that the Red forces are quite that good; otherwise they would have moved in on us before now. He thinks it "absurd to think that a regime which murdered and enslaved millions of its own people to establish communism would hesitate to destroy the one nation that is strong enough to defeat them."

The Captain's view gets support from Lenin, who said that the revolutionary "must evaluate war not by the number of casualties but by its political consequences. Above the interests of individuals perishing and suffering from war must stand the interests of the class." On another occasion Lenin said: "To tie one's hands beforehand, openly to tell the enemy, who is at present better armed than we, whether and when we shall fight him is stupidity and not revolutionariness. To accept battle at a time when it is obviously advantageous to the enemy and not to us is a crime."

Americans, accustomed to having wars "forced upon them" when they are least prepared, find it difficult to understand this acceptance of war as a tool and not as an accidental calamity. But such is the long-held theory of our Communist adversary. While reason tells us that this is so, habit compels us to act in dealing with the Red brigands as if we were conversing with Sir Edward Grey in a fur hat.

Amid so much confusion of fact and counsel, nobody but the brashest publicist would undertake to pose a solution. Probably, as Sisley Huddleston concluded, we cannot kick over the table and break up the game. But surely we can state what our objectives are. In my book, they have been well stated by Dr. Possony, who decries the idea that our policy should be conceived in fear. Rather, he writes, "the objective of our policy should be to make all-out war an *extreme risk* for the Soviets and to work toward a gradual modification, contraction, and replacement of Soviet rule."

Support from the highest American sources for the second half of Dr. Possony's statement of aims would undoubtedly have an electrifying effect on the morale, hopes and fighting spirit of millions of silent people behind the Iron Curtain, without whose assistance our chances look rather dim.

Frederic Nelson has been Associate Editor of the *Saturday Evening Post,* in charge of the editorial page, since 1942. He won the Freedoms Foundation Award, for an editorial, in 1951. His most recent contribution to HUMAN EVENTS was "New Dealers – Then and Now," December 14, 1957.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Send me.....reprints of "WHAT WOULD A 'PREVENTIVE WAR' PREVENT?" at $..... ☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 4-page article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately – at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $10

Name.....

Street.....

City.....Zone.....State.....

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED